

**REMARKS**

Claims 46-65 are now pending. Applicant has amended claims 54-65.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone interview of July 31, 2007. During that interview, applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the Janay reference in particular at column 4, lines 8-26. The Examiner relies on Janay to add a document type as context to Jokela, which is the primary reference. Janay uses document type to identify a template and fill-in data provided by a transmitting computer to a receiving computer. Janay's document type is not used by a server to identify an action that is then provided to a client as recited by the claims.

The Examiner objected to the claims because of a mis-numbering. Applicant has corrected the numbering of the claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 50, 58, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The specification clearly describes that "context" information is sent from a client to a server. The specification provides several examples of a context such as "user role, application, environment." (Specification, p. 11, lines 8-9.) The specification also states that documents "can be opened in a productivity application." (Specification, 7:1.) One skilled in the art would clearly understand that the mentioned "application" would be the application that has the document opened as recited by these claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 55-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected all the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on a combination of references as outlined in the following table:

Claims	References
46-50, 54, 61-64	Jokela, Allen, and Janay
51-52	Jokela, Allen, Janay, and Goldberg
53, 65	Jokela, Allen, Janay, and Hita
55	Jokela and Janay
56-58	Jokela, Allen, and Janay
59-60	Jokela, Janay, Hita, and Goldberg

The Examiner has rejected all the claims based on Janay in combination with other references. The Examiner believes that Janay "discloses the concept of transmitting a document type code to fill in appropriate data within a document." (Office Action, June 25, 2007, p. 6.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Janay describes that the document type is used by a "receiving computer to check documents arriving and ensure no inconsistencies." (Janay, 3:57-59.) According to Janay, a document template and its fill-in information are transmitted separately to the receiving computer. (Janay, 1:59-2:6.) The fill-in information that is transmitted to the receiving computer already includes the fill data of the form. For example, Figure 3 of Janay illustrates fill-in information that is transmitted to a receiving computer. (Janay, 3:6-19.) As can be seen, the fill-in information of Figure 3 already includes the appropriate data such as "Joseph" and "130 Elm Street." Janay transmits a document type so that the receiving computer can "check" all of the fill-in information. (Janay, 1:65-66.) Janay neither teaches nor suggests that the document type is transmitted "to fill in appropriate data within a document" as the Examiner suggests.

Because Janay does not transmit "a document type code to fill in appropriate data within a document," this cannot possibly be a proper motivation for one skilled in the art to combine Janay with the other reference. The Supreme Court has recently made it clear that it can be important "to identify a reason that would have prompted of person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new

invention does." (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385, 1396 (2007).) The Examiner has not done so.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268741US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio  
Maurice J. Pirio  
Registration No.: 33,273  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant